1 3.18 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The lead agency shall find that a project may have a significant effect on the environment and thereby require an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to be prepared for the Project where there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record, that any of the following conditions may occur. Where prior to commencement of the environmental analysis a project proponent agrees to mitigation measures or project modifications that would avoid any significant effect on the environment or would mitigate the significant environmental effect, a lead agency need not prepare an EIR solely because without mitigation the environmental effects would have been significant (per State CEQA Guidelines, § 15065):

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of past, present and probable future projects)?				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				

11 3.18.1 Impact Analysis

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- 1 Less than Significant with Mitigation. As described in Section 3.4, Biological 2 Resources, with the implementation of MMs, the proposed Project would not result in 3 significant impacts to sensitive marine resources and would not have a significant effect on listed species or habitat used by those species. The Project could potentially 4 5 increase suspended sediments and disturb habitat and thus degrade the quality of the 6 environment within the Project area. However, these impacts can be avoided or minimized as described in Sections 2, Project Description, and 3, Environmental 7 8 Analysis, and would be inherently limited due to the temporary and short duration (8 9 weeks) of the Project. The Project would not be expected to substantially reduce the 10 habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-11 sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the 12 number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals.
- 13 As described in Section 3.5, Cultural Resources, the proposed Project would not result 14 in significant impacts to any known cultural resources and implementation of the MMs 15
- described in that section ensure that if previously undetected resources are
- 16 encountered during the Project, the potential impacts would be avoided/minimized.
- 17 With implementation of the Project MMs, impacts associated with the proposed Project
- would be less than significant. 18
- 19 b) Does the project have impacts that would be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the 20 21 incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with 22 the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects
- 23 of probable future projects.)
- 24 Less Than Significant Impact. A review of CSLC and Contra Costa County project 25 lists shows no projects with potentially overlapping impacts that would occur coincident
- 26 with Project construction impacts. Two projects are planned in the city of Antioch within
- 27 2 miles of the GP wharf that are currently underway and scheduled to be completed in
- late 2015. The final tasks of these projects may overlap in time with the GP Antioch 28
- 29 wharf construction schedule. A summary of these projects and schedules is as follows:
- 30 Lone Tree Way/A Street—State Highway 4 Interchange
- 31 The Lone Tree Way/A Street segment is the fourth construction segment along the
- 32 Highway 4 widening project corridor, between Contra Loma Boulevard/L Street and
- 33 Hillcrest Avenue in Antioch. The project is within 2 miles of the GP Antioch wharf
- 34 upgrade project. It will expand Highway 4 from four to eight lanes, including three mixed
- 35 flow lanes and one High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane, from just west of Lone Tree
- 36 Way/A Street to just west of Hillcrest Avenue. The project includes reconstruction of the
- 37 Lone Tree Way/A Street Interchange and widening the highway median to

- 1 accommodate mass transit (East Contra Costa BART extension or eBART). Upcoming construction is projected to include the following:
 - Complete construction of the foundation for the Lone Tree Way/A Street bridge;
 - Complete the construction of the foundation for the Cavallo Road bridge;
 - Construct various drainage improvements on the project;
 - Construct the westbound Highway 4 interior lanes and median between Hillcrest Avenue and Cavallo Road;
- Complete the construction of the interior portion of the Pedestrian Undercrossing east of Lone Tree Way/A Street.
- 10 Project construction began in August 2012 and the segment is expected to be open to
- 11 traffic in late 2015. The final construction tasks of this project (in late summer of 2015)
- may overlap in time with the planned Project construction period from August 1 through
- 13 November 30, 2015.

3

4

5

6 7

- 14 Hillcrest Avenue—Highway 4/ eBART Project
- 15 Construction on the Hillcrest Avenue segment of the Highway 4 widening project is less
- 16 than 2 miles from the GP Antioch wharf upgrade project. It is the fifth and final
- 17 construction segment along the main project corridor, ending in the city of Antioch. The
- 18 project would widen the highway from four to eight lanes, including three mixed flow
- 19 lanes and one HOV lane. The project includes a median wide enough to accommodate
- 20 mass transit (eBART), as well as provisions for a new eBART station just east of
- 21 Hillcrest Avenue. Construction began in March 2013 and the segment is expected to be
- 22 open to traffic in late 2015. Upcoming construction that is currently projected includes
- 23 the following:

25

- Continue construction of retaining walls at various locations on the project;
 - Continue electrical work at various locations on the project;
- Begin construction of the public overcrossing;
- Continue demo of old roadway alignment.
- 28 The final segments of the Hillcrest Avenue/ Highway 4 project (in late summer of 2015)
- 29 may overlap in time with the planned Project construction period from August 1 through
- 30 November 30, 2015.
- 31 The compliance of the Project with the regional Air Quality Management Plan combined
- 32 with the short-term, construction-only air emissions that are less than significant, would
- 33 ensure that there are no potentially significant cumulative construction impacts to air
- 34 quality in the region as a result of the Project.

- 1 Because the Project would not have any post-construction impacts, it would not
- 2 contribute to any cumulative impacts from other projects proposed nearby that are not
- 3 coincident with the proposed Project's construction period.
- 4 c) Does the project have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?
- 6 Less Than Significant with Mitigation. As described in Section 3.8, Hazards and
- 7 Hazardous Materials, implementation of Project MMs would ensure potential impacts
- 8 are less than significant. In addition, the Project would not result in environmental
- 9 effects related to air quality or noise, or any other impacts that would cause substantial
- 10 adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly due to its short duration
- 11 and limited Project area.

Environmental	Checklist and	Analysis _	Mandatory	Findings of	f Significance
	CHECKIIST AHU.	Alialysis —	iviai iualui y	riiiuiiiys u	ı Sıyı IIIICALIC C

This page left intentionally blank